

Skin Moisturization Study:

Fig.1 Graph of the mean visual scores for the Dryness data.




Table 1

Evaluation Time	Baseline	1	2	4	6	8	24
Post-Foamer GG	1.95	0.35	0.43	0.65	0.73	0.78	1.63
Post-Foamer HH	1.90	0.10	0.23	0.33	0.50	0.50	1.60
Post-Foamer II	2.03	0.23	0.18	0.38	0.45	0.43	1.58
Post-Foamer A	1.98	0.63	1.05	1.18	1.35	1.33	1.80
II Neat	1.85	0.08	0.20	0.28	0.40	0.43	1.45
Untreated	1.90	1.80	1.80	1.75	1.83	1.88	1.80

Table 1 - Dryness Data

Skin Moisturization Study:

Fig. 2

Graph of the average replicate scores for the Skicon data




Table 2 - Skicon Data

Evaluation Time	1	2	4	8	16	24	28
Post-Foamer G	90.10	76.81	76.08	75.59	77.64		79.77
Post-Foamer H	84.10	85.46	82.90	82.74	82.82		83.97
Post-Foamer II	84.10	81.70	80.92	84.10	82.94		86.79
Post-Foamer A	90.10	81.70	59.78	61.15	60.62		73.72
Untreated	81.32	83.11	85.56	83.00	81.20		79.75
							82.65

Fig. 3 Skin Moisturization Study:

Graph of the average replicate scores for the Corneometer data




Table 3 - Corneometer Data




Fig. 4

Viscosity vs. Shear stress for Edge (R) gel




Fig. 5

Viscosity vs. Shear stress of inventive and comparative lotion concentrates




Fig. 6

Expanded version of Fig. 5 showing comparative isotropic lotion base A in more detail

(1)

(2)




Fig. 7

Foam stability of inventive lamellar post foaming lotion (1) compared to comparative isotropic post foaming gel (2).